

Amendments to the Drawings:

The Examiner indicates in paragraph 2 of the Office Action dated October 18, 2005, that no replacement drawings for Figs. 1 and 2 were found accompanying the Preliminary Amendment dated January 28, 2004. Therefore, replacement sheets with the amended drawings are now attached. These sheets, which include Figs. 1 and 2, replace the original sheets that included Figs. 1 and 2. Reference numeral 23 was added to both Figs. 1 and 2. The amendment to Fig. 2 also corrects a minor typographical error by renumbering the block originally incorrectly labeled 20 and located in the path of line 40, to the proper reference numeral 60.

Attachment: Replacement sheets (Figs. 1 and 2)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is filed in response to the outstanding Office Action dated October 18, 2005. Claims 1, 2, 6 - 8, and 11 - 13 have been cancelled. Claims 3 - 5, 9, 10, and 14 - 18 remain pending in the application, of which Claims 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, and 17 are now independent claims.

Claims 1 and 2

Claims 1 and 2 have been cancelled.

Claim 3

The Examiner rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of the Watanabe reference, claiming that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a second seal on the piston as a mere duplication of parts in order to optimize the movement of the piston within the housing. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Watanabe reference contains no teaching or suggestion that a second seal is desirable, and in particular does not teach the particular arrangement claimed by Applicants, that is " with a first seal disposed about the first end of said floating piston, ... and ... a second seal disposed about the second end of said floating piston". This is not a mere duplication of parts, but rather disclosure of a specific arrangement of components not taught or suggested by the Watanabe reference.

Claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form; accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 3.

Claims 4 and 5

In paragraph 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 4 and 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have done so, and request allowance of these claims.

Claims 6- 8

Claims 6 - 8 have been cancelled.

Claims 9 and 10

In paragraph 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 9 and 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have done so, and request allowance of these claims.

Claims 11- 13

Claims 11 - 13 have been cancelled.

Claims 14 and 15

In paragraph 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 14 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have done so, and request allowance of these claims.

Claim 16

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating in paragraph 13 of the Office Action that Claim 16 has been allowed.

Claim 17

In paragraph 11, the Examiner indicated that Claim 17 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the §112 rejection of paragraph 4 and 5 of the Office Action. The Examiner was correct in his supposition that the phrase "said first source" on line 6 should have been "said second source". Applicants have so amended the claim, and request allowance of this claim.

Application No. 10/766,080
Amdt. dated January 16, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

Claim 18

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claim 18 was rejected under §112 due to it's dependence on Claim 17, which was also rejected as being indefinite. With the amendment to Claim 17, Applicants have traversed this rejection, and request allowance of this claim.

Concluding Remarks

In view of these amendments and remarks, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, and early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Allen W. Inks
Reg. No. 37,358

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(419) 255-5900